



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## ARMS CONTROL (GENERAL)

### **Conference on Disarmament Hears Statements by Norway, China, Italy, Pakistan, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

*The United Nations Office at Geneva, 15 February 2005, [www.disarmament.un.org](http://www.disarmament.un.org)*

The Conference on Disarmament today heard statements by Norway on its priorities within the Conference, China on a joint seminar on prevention of an arms race in outer space, and Pakistan on the stalemate within the Conference. (657 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **IAEA Board Meetings Open 28 February in Vienna**

*IAEA, 16 February 2005, [www.iaea.org](http://www.iaea.org)*

The 35-member IAEA Board of Governors opens its next meetings in Vienna 28 February. Items on the agenda principally are related to the IAEA's work in areas of nuclear safeguards and safety. (164 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

## CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC)

### **Russia Speeds Chemical Weapon Disposal**

*Arms Control Association, January/February 2005, [www.armscontrol.org](http://www.armscontrol.org)*

The destruction of Russia's massive Soviet-era chemical weapons stockpile has been proceeding glacially, but recent actions by Russian and U.S. leaders may allow this pace to be accelerated substantially. (904 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Last Mustard Agent Removed from Aberdeen Yard**

*Army News Service, 11 February 2005, [www.cma.army.mil](http://www.cma.army.mil)*

The Army removed the last container of mustard agent from Aberdeen's Chemical Agent Storage Yard Feb. 2, ending 61 years of the agent's bulk storage at Aberdeen Proving Ground. (402 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Burns on Schedule at Anniston's Chemical Weapons Incinerator**

*The Associated Press, 14 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Officials at Anniston Army Depot's chemical weapons incinerator said they are on schedule for destroying Cold War-era munitions with 58 percent of the sarin nerve agent already gone. (124 words) [Click here for full text.](#)



Back  
to Top

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC) (CONT.)

### **Pentagon Has Funds for Work at Depot**

*The Kansas City Star*, 15 February 2005, [www.kansascity.com](http://www.kansascity.com)

Lost amid the controversy over next year's proposed funding cuts for the chemical neutralization plant at Blue Grass Army Depot is this: The Pentagon already has on hand more than enough money to keep work going for the next couple of years. (689 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Plan To Destroy Dangerous Weapons On-Site Continues**

*WKYT NewsFirst*, 16 February 2005, [www.wkyt.com](http://www.wkyt.com)

An upbeat assessment of progress on plans to build a two billion dollar plant to destroy the Blue Grass Army Depot's chemical weapons has been offered. (104 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

## COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY(CTBT)

### **Iran Says Explosion Caused by Road Blasting**

*Agence France-Presse*, 16 February 2005, accessed via [www.spacewar.com](http://www.spacewar.com)

A powerful explosion in southern Iran on Wednesday which raised jitters of a possible attack on the country's nuclear installations, was a result of road blasting... (75 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **China and Australia in Uranium Sales Negotiations**

*Agence France-Presse*, 17 February 2005, accessed via [lexis-nexis](http://lexis-nexis)

Australia has begun negotiations on selling uranium to China with the next round of talks due to begin next week... (333 words) [Click here for full text.](#)



Back  
to Top

## CONVENTIONAL ARMED FORCES IN EUROPE (CFE)

### **Russia, Georgia to Look for Compromise on Security Issues**

*ITAR-TASS*, 14 February 2005, accessed via [lexis-nexis](http://lexis-nexis)

Russia and Georgia will continue the search for "mutually acceptable solutions" to each other's security problems... (907 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## MISSILE TECHNOLOGY CONTROL REGIME (MTCR)

### **Missile Defense System Talks Ongoing, Graham Says**

*The Record*, 11 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis

Canadian participation in the U.S. missile defense program is still a live issue, despite opposition within the Liberal caucus and among rank-and-file in the party... (419 words)

[Click here for full text.](#)

### **U.S. Interceptor Missile Fails to Launch in Test**

*Reuters*, 15 February 2005, [www.reuters.com](http://www.reuters.com)

President Bush's planned ballistic missile shield suffered another setback on Monday when an interceptor missile again failed to launch during a test of the U.S. missile defense system. (471 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Japan's Cabinet OKs Missile Defense Bill**

*The Associated Press*, 15 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)

Japan's defense chief could order the military to shoot down incoming missiles under legislation endorsed by the Cabinet on Tuesday... (456 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

## NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT)

### **Iran-EU Nuclear Negotiations Begin**

*Arms Control Association*, January/February 2005, [www.armscontrol.org](http://www.armscontrol.org)

Foreign ministers from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom met Dec.13...to open negotiations toward a long-term resolution of concerns surrounding Tehran's nuclear programs. (1,046 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Report: N. Korea Demands Talks With U.S.**

*The Associated Press*, 11 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)

North Korea has demanded bilateral talks with the United States to defuse the tension created by its announcement that it is a nuclear power... (936 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **US Rejects Bilateral Talks with North Korea on Nuclear Issue**

*The Press Trust of India*, 12 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis

The United States has rejected the possibility of bilateral talks with North Korea on the nuclear issue and asserted that the six-party parleys hosted by China were the way to resolve the matter. (483 words) [Click here for full text.](#)



Back  
to Top

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT) (CONT.)

### **Iran Shuns Demand to Abandon Nuke Reactor**

*The Associated Press, 13 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Iran rejected a European demand to stop building a heavy-water nuclear reactor that provides a simpler way of extracting weapons-grade fuel, and it warned the United States on Sunday "not to play with fire" by repeatedly threatening Tehran. (653 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Bush: Nuclear Weapon Can Cause Irans Destabilizing**

*News From Russia, 14 February 2005, [www.newsfromrussia.com](http://www.newsfromrussia.com)*

U.S. sources have given conflicting signals about the veracity of a Washington Post report that said America has been using unmanned flights for the past year to gather intelligence on Iran's nuclear capability. (346 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **IAEA: Egypt Up Front About Atomic Arms**

*The Associated Press, 14 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Egypt's nuclear experiments were small, basic and do not appear part of an attempt to make weapons... (645 words) [Click here for full text.](#)

### **Iran Six Months from Having Knowledge to Build Nuclear Bomb: Israel**

*Agence France-Presse, 16 February 2005, accessed via [www.spacewar.com](http://www.spacewar.com)*

Iran is only six months away from having the knowledge to build a nuclear bomb, Israeli Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom said Wednesday during a visit to London. (519 words)

[Click here for full text.](#)

## FULL TEXT OF WEEKLY ARTICLES FOLLOWS:



---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

## Conference on Disarmament Hears Statements by Norway, China, Italy, Pakistan, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

The United Nations Office at Geneva, 15 February 2005, [www.disarmament.un.org](http://www.disarmament.un.org)

The Conference on Disarmament today heard statements by Norway on its priorities within the Conference, China on a joint seminar on prevention of an arms race in outer space, and Pakistan on the stalemate within the Conference. Italy provided a general statement which touched on the announcement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that it possessed nuclear weapons. It was rejected by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The President of the Conference, Ambassador Chris Sanders of the Netherlands, said that last week, he had circulated a text on a possible announcement by the President on the identification of Special Coordinators for four subsidiary bodies and their mandates within the Conference. After informal consultations and careful consideration of the various views of the Members of the Conference, he had decided not to make this announcement. However, he wished to go on record that this decision had no legal interpretation for the question on whether the President had the authority to identify a Special Coordinator. It remained his view that the President of the Conference indeed had this authority.

Norway suggested that the Conference seriously consider organizing plenary meetings only when there was a real need, and said that it believed that it should be possible for the Conference to establish three or four subsidiary bodies and mandates. Norway's first priority remained the start of negotiations with a view to achieving a verifiable treaty to stop the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons purposes.

Pakistan said that there had been calls to suspend the Conference. He respected this idea but begged to differ with it. In order to revive a body, it should not be put to sleep. The objective should be to remain engaged; the process of exploration, effort and endeavor must continue. If the Conference continued this way, there would be a total vacuum, and multilateralism like nature abhorred vacuum. So the duties of the Conference would be taken over by other forums and this would be a collective misfortune for everyone.

China said that in order to consolidate the international community's common understanding on the issue of prevention of an arms race in outer space, China, Russia, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and Canada's Simons Foundation would jointly hold an international conference on "Safeguarding Space Security: Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space" on 21 and 22 March at the Palais des Nations.

Italy was pleased that an agreement had been reached on the agenda, and that on that basis, the Conference would now seek to proceed in its institutional tasks. The Conference should be in tune with issues which were relevant with the current international security environment. In this connection, Italy wished to refer to the recent announcement by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on the possession of nuclear weapons. Italy recalled the statement made in this respect by the Presidency of the European Union which, inter alia, expressed its strong preoccupation with the declaration and its regret for the announcement of the suspension of the

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

participation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in the multilateral negotiations on its nuclear program.

In response, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea said that while the Conference had not held any substantive discussions for eight years, suddenly, an irrelevant issue was brought up by Italy on the nuclear issue which was between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States. The concern of Italy should be based on a correct and proper stance to help resolve this issue. However, the concern of Italy had been off track. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea had a very big obstacle in the holding of the six-way talks, and it had found that the obstacles facing the Conference came from the same source.

The next plenary of the Conference will be held at 10 a.m. on Thursday, 17 February. The Foreign Minister of Kazakhstan, Kassymzhomart Tokaev, will address that meeting.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## IAEA Board Meetings Open 28 February in Vienna

IAEA, 16 February 2005, [www.iaea.org](http://www.iaea.org)

The 35-member IAEA Board of Governors opens its next meetings in Vienna 28 February. Items on the agenda principally are related to the IAEA's work in areas of nuclear safeguards and safety. The Board also is considering the appointment of the Director General for a four-year term beginning 1 December 2005. (See Related Resources.)

In his introductory statement, IAEA Director General Dr. Mohamed ElBaradei is expected to brief the Board on the Agency's implementation of safeguards agreements with Iran, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea), and Egypt. In an interview with the Washington Post published 16 February, Dr. ElBaradei addressed aspects of the IAEA's verification in Iran and North Korea.

Regarding safeguards in Egypt, the Director General has circulated his report to the IAEA's Member States. Unless the IAEA Board decides otherwise, the document's circulation is restricted and it cannot be released to the public. The report addresses recent IAEA inspections and verification work in Egypt under the country's comprehensive safeguards agreement.



*Back  
to Top*

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Russia Speeds Chemical Weapon Disposal

*Arms Control Association, January/February 2005, [www.armscontrol.org](http://www.armscontrol.org)*

The destruction of Russia's massive Soviet-era chemical weapons stockpile has been proceeding glacially, but recent actions by Russian and U.S. leaders may allow this pace to be accelerated substantially.

With slightly more than 40,000 metric tons, Russia has the world's largest declared stockpile of chemical weapons but is the furthest from completing the destruction process among the six states that have pledged to eliminate declared stockpiles under the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Russia has been given multiple interim-deadline extensions and has been granted in principle the one-time, five-year extension to the final deadline of 2007, but U.S. officials doubt it will meet the extended deadline either. By the end of 2004, Russia had destroyed less than 3 percent of its stockpile.

To speed up destruction, President Vladimir Putin signed the 2005 federal budget approved by the Duma and Federation Council into law Dec. 24 providing \$400 million for chemical weapons destruction, more than twice the \$186 million allocated in 2004. Russian officials attributed the large increase to an effort to make up for what they said was disappointing support from international donors.

Col. Gen. Victor Kholstov, head of the Russian chemical demilitarization program, and other officials have pointed to a report from the Russian government that found that only 30 percent of the funds designated by the United States for Russian chemical weapons disposal activities were being given to Russia; the rest was being used to monitor the use of the funds. However, when pressed as to whether the Kremlin had counted U.S. funding used to purchase equipment in the United States, Kholstov admitted that the 30 percent figure included only what had been transferred to Russia's Federal Agency on Industry.

In the United States, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) plans to reintroduce legislation next year that would eliminate six conditions placed by lawmakers on U.S. funding of a major chemical weapons destruction facility at Shchuch'ye. (See ACT, December 2004.) In the past, these stipulations have suspended or delayed the flow of such funds to Russia. Since 2002, President George W. Bush has had and used the authority to waive the conditions on national security grounds, but it has been necessary for Congress to renew the waiver authority each year.

The most recent defense authorization bill granted the president waiver authority through December 2006. The president signed a waiver of these stipulations Nov. 29, releasing U.S. funding through the end of the 2005 calendar year. The fiscal 2005 defense authorization bill earmarks \$158.4 million through September toward the construction of the chemical weapons destruction plant at Shchuch'ye.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

Two conditions have been particularly difficult to meet, making a waiver necessary. One requires that Russia develop a practical plan for nerve agent destruction, while the other requires that Russia destroy all nerve agents at a single location. In a 2001 agreement, Russia pledged to complete the destruction process of all nerve agents at the Shchuch'ye facility.

Patrick Wakefield, deputy assistant to the secretary of defense for chemical demilitarization and threat reduction, told a Moscow audience in November that Russia and the United States had recently agreed to a more realistic plan to complete construction by July 2008 and begin destruction in mid-2009. Russia had been insisting that the facility would be ready by 2006.

The Shchuch'ye requirement, however, remains a sticking point.

The original intent of the requirement to destroy all nerve agents at one location was to protect the U.S. investment in the Shchuch'ye facility, where the United States expects to spend \$1 billion over the course of the project—a hefty price tag for a location that only has 13.6 percent of Russia's chemical weapons stockpile.

The stipulations have generated resentment on the Russian side, with one Russian official telling a U.S. audience late last summer that the requirement was setting Russia up for failure because there was not enough time to destroy all the nerve agent at one facility. The requirements would also require Russia to transport chemical munitions and agent, or caustic reaction mass (the by-product of the neutralization process), over several hundred miles by rail.

The Russians have pointed out that, by contrast, the United States plans to construct destruction facilities at each of its present chemical weapons storage locations and that plans to transport the reaction mass ran into significant opposition by local communities.

A report completed last April by the General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office) agreed with the Russian assessment, noting that, if the Shchuch'ye plant operated at its full destruction capacity of 1,700 metric tons per year, Russia would not complete the destruction of its nerve agent stockpile until 2027.

Russian nerve agents are stored at five different locations, including Shchuch'ye, and Russian officials have suggested that it may decide to construct disposal facilities at all locations. Several countries have committed funding for additional nerve agent destruction facilities. Although additional international donors were welcomed, one U.S. official cautioned that Russia may turn around and blame new donors for future delays.

The original agreement with the United States allows Russia to perform some neutralization on-site but required all nerve agent reaction mass to be transported to Shchuch'ye and destroyed. Russia has not finalized its plans and could choose to finish the neutralization process at each location or set the reaction mass aside for use in commercial industrial processes. Either option would violate the agreement with the United States and the conditions imposed by Congress.

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Last Mustard Agent Removed from Aberdeen Yard

Army News Service, 11 February 2005, [www.cma.army.mil](http://www.cma.army.mil)

The Army removed the last container of mustard agent from Aberdeen's Chemical Agent Storage Yard Feb. 2, ending 61 years of the agent's bulk storage at Aberdeen Proving Ground.

The container was taken to the next-door Aberdeen Chemical Agent Disposal Facility for destruction. This made Aberdeen the first of eight Army stockpile sites in the continental United States to have emptied its storage area, officials said, eliminating any risk the stored agent posed to surrounding communities.

The disposal facility is a pilot plant using a new technology to neutralize mustard agent by blending it with hot water and sodium hydroxide, officials said. They explained that emptied containers from the stockpile are processed through a second pilot plant, the Ton Container Cleanout facility, in which each container is triple rinsed using high-pressure water spray. Containers are then cut in half, are decontaminated and are monitored before recycling.

With the removal of the last ton container by the Edgewood Chemical Activity, supported by the 22d Chemical Battalion (Technical Escort), officials said the Aberdeen facility enters the final phase of its mission to destroy the stockpile.

Teamwork was essential to reach this month's milestone, said Edgewood Chemical Activity Commander Lt. Col. Gerald Gladney.

"The [Edgewood activity] and 22d Chemical Battalion worked hand-in-glove to make sure that the destruction of the stockpile was never delayed by the availability of ton containers," Gladney said. "Members of both teams came in weekdays and weekends, and worked in all weather to keep pace with [the disposal facility] as the containers were drained and the agent destroyed," he said.

The first ton container was removed from Aberdeen's Chemical Agent Storage Yard in April 2003 when the disposal facility began operations. Since then, ECA has managed the safe movement of 1,817 ton containers containing 1,623 tons of mustard agent.

Destruction of the bulk chemical agent and chemical munitions in the remaining Army stockpiles is required under the international 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention treaty and Congressional mandate.

To date, the Army has safely destroyed more than 33 percent of the nation's stored chemical agent, officials said.

Other sites currently destroying stockpiles include:

\* Tooele Chemical Agent Disposal Facility in Utah, which has destroyed more than 50 percent of its chemical agent

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

\* Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Ala.

\* Umatilla Chemical Agent Disposal Facility, Ore.

More information on these stockpile sites and the Army's chemical demilitarization program can be found at [www.cma.army.mil](http://www.cma.army.mil).



*Back  
to Top*

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Burns on Schedule at Anniston's Chemical Weapons Incinerator

*The Associated Press, 14 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Officials at Anniston Army Depot's chemical weapons incinerator said they are on schedule for destroying Cold War-era munitions with 58 percent of the sarin nerve agent already gone.

"We're where we thought we would be, from a schedule perspective," said Tim Garrett, Army project site manager at the Anniston Chemical Agent Disposal Facility. "But safety's our priority."

The base had 873,020 pounds of GB nerve agent, or sarin, when disposal began in 2003. Depot officials told The Anniston Star in a story Monday the incinerator had destroyed 508,905 pounds of sarin through Feb. 10.

Plant crews have turned their attention to GB-filled projectiles or artillery shells this year and are currently destroying 8-inch projectiles. The 155-mm GB projectiles and 105-mm GB projectiles will follow.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Pentagon Has Funds for Work at Depot

*The Kansas City Star*, 15 February 2005, [www.kansascity.com](http://www.kansascity.com)

Lost amid the controversy over next year's proposed funding cuts for the chemical neutralization plant at Blue Grass Army Depot is this: The Pentagon already has on hand more than enough money to keep work going for the next couple of years.

However, a budget analysis by the Chemical Weapons Working Group shows that the Pentagon has impounded more than \$400 million that Congress appropriated for neutralization plants in Madison County and Pueblo, Colo.

Officials haven't explained why the money has been impounded. But the move by the Pentagon to redirect it usurps Congress's role as the decision-making body for military spending, said Craig Williams, director of the Berea-based watchdog organization.

U.S. Sens. Wayne Allard, R-Colo., and Ken Salazar, D-Colo., appear to agree. Last week they called on the Pentagon to release funds and begin construction in Pueblo.

"It is unconscionable to me that the Department of Defense wants to delay this project when the Congress has provided ample funding during the past two appropriations cycles," Allard said in a statement.

Pentagon spokeswoman Sandra Burr did not respond to e-mailed questions yesterday.

The Blue Grass plant will use some of the technology that has been developed for Pueblo. But the Pentagon ordered a halt to design work in November 2003. The design staff for Pueblo has been cut from about 400 people to 140, said John Schlatter, a spokesman for the contractor, Bechtel Pueblo.

Last month, the company canceled seven procurements for construction contracts in Colorado.

In Kentucky, Bechtel Parsons Blue Grass has halted construction work and hiring while the budget problem is sorted out.

Bechtel Parsons is contracted to build and operate the \$2 billion neutralization plant at the depot. It was proposed as part of a nationwide effort to destroy the nation's 31,500 tons of aging chemical weapons by April 2012, a deadline set by an international treaty.

More than 500 tons of nerve and mustard agent are stored at the depot, a few miles southeast of downtown Richmond.

The hundreds of millions impounded by the Pentagon includes \$70 million that the federal agency which oversees the Blue Grass and Pueblo projects has received but cannot spend.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



Back  
to Top



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

Michael Parker, program manager for that agency, called Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives, did not return a phone call seeking comment.

The two ACWA plants were thought to be in line to receive \$250 million in the next fiscal year -- and even that would have been far below the \$400 million needed to carry out a Pentagon directive to accelerate destruction of the weapons.

Instead, President Bush's budget proposed that ACWA receive \$31 million for the two plants next year.

The budget cut is unprecedented for Kentucky, but Pueblo has been there before. Last year its budget was cut from \$151.7 million to \$4.8 million. Allard succeeded in getting \$50 million added back, but that money has been frozen as well.

Of the \$147 million cut from the Pueblo budget, \$69 million went to solve problems at the nation's four active incineration sites, including a July 2002 mustard-agent leak at Deseret in Utah. Two plants needed more money because they could not attract enough qualified workers, according to budget documents sent to U.S. House and Senate committees.

An additional \$30 million went to Edgewood Chemical Activity, a neutralization site in Aberdeen, Md. Most of the rest went to improve monitoring and other safety measures at incineration sites.

Allard and Salazar have asked Michael Wynne, an acting undersecretary of defense, to release the money already appropriated so the early phases of construction at Pueblo can be completed. Kentucky officials hope U.S. Sen. Mitch McConnell, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, will be able to restore funding for Blue Grass.

The Army is studying options such as building smaller, cheaper plants or transporting weapons to incinerator sites. The study of transportation alternatives will be completed next month.

In the meantime, there's no reason to halt construction of roads, utilities and support buildings, Williams said -- if you're going to keep your promise to build a neutralization plant.

"The real agenda," he suggested, "is to not build anything at these two sites."



---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Plan To Destroy Dangerous Weapons On-Site Continues

WKYT NewsFirst, 16 February 2005, [www.wkyt.com](http://www.wkyt.com)

An upbeat assessment of progress on plans to build a two billion dollar plant to destroy the Blue Grass Army Depot's chemical weapons has been offered.

The Chemical Destruction Community Advisory Board in Richmond heard the report Tuesday.

Permits are being obtained ahead of schedule and the plant design is 60 percent complete.

Board members got to see an animated display showing how robots would chop rockets into pieces and remove the chemical agent inside.

But much of the work is on hold because President Bush's proposed budget contains little money for research and no money for construction of the plant until Fiscal 2011.



Back  
to Top

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Iran Says Explosion Caused by Road Blasting

*Agence France-Presse, 16 February 2005, accessed via [www.spacewar.com](http://www.spacewar.com)*

A powerful explosion in southern Iran on Wednesday which raised jitters of a possible attack on the country's nuclear installations, was a result of road blasting, a senior security official said.

"It was an explosion set deliberately to blast through rock and open a road," Supreme National Security Council spokesman Agha Mohammadi told AFP. "In no circumstances was it an attack against the Islamic republic's nuclear installations."



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## China and Australia in uranium sales negotiations

*Agence France-Presse, 17 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis*

Australia has begun negotiations on selling uranium to China with the next round of talks due to begin next week, a senior official said Thursday.

John Carlson, a high-ranking official in the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, told a Senate committee that informal talks had already begun.

"I will be traveling to Beijing at the weekend to progress those discussions," he said.

Carlson said Australia would insist on safeguards to ensure any fissile material was not used for nuclear weapons, notably insisting that any buyer be party to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

"We require that supplied nuclear material be used for exclusively peaceful purposes and that excludes not only nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive uses but also military propulsion or use in depleted uranium munitions," he said.

Australia would also require that its nuclear material be subject to China's agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and that Canberra's prior consent be necessary before "any high enrichment reprocessing or transfer to third parties," he said.

Opposition lawmakers raised objections.

"We do not believe China has committed to sufficient international non-proliferation action, nor has it signed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty," said Andrew Bartlett of the Democrats party.

"In the case of uranium and nuclear materials, the danger is extreme, so the caution the federal government exercises in considering any increase in uranium exports must also be extreme," he said.

Australia's uranium resources have been under the spotlight recently as a result of a hostile takeover bid for national miner WMC Resources by the Swiss-based company Xstrata.

If successful, the takeover would give Xstrata control over one of the world's biggest uranium deposits at the Olympic Dam mine in South Australia.

Chinese ambassador Fu Ying said Thursday that China was considering an expansion of nuclear power and was interested in buying uranium from overseas.

"We also understand countries that export uranium will require a safeguard agreement and China will be very happy to enter into negotiations with countries on that," she said.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Russia, Georgia to Look for Compromise on Security Issues

ITAR-TASS, 14 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis

Russia and Georgia will continue the search for "mutually acceptable solutions" to each other's security problems, the Foreign Ministry said on Monday.

The delegations of the two countries held talks in Tbilisi on February 10-11 to work out a draft agreement and discuss military issues.

"These are, first of all, the non-deployment of military bases of third countries and the creation of joint anti-terrorist centers in the context of the withdrawal of the Russian bases in Batumi and Akhalkalaki from Georgia," the ministry said.

The ministry expressed regret that the meetings in Tbilisi "did not produce concrete results".

"We went to Tbilisi hoping for considerable progress in the resolution of our problems. But the talks showed that the Georgian side deviated from the agreed-upon positions," the ministry said.

It said that Georgia pledged in the Russian-Georgian statement made in Istanbul in November 1999 to "give the Russian side the right for a temporary deployment of its weapons and hardware, limited by the treaty, at the bases in Batumi and Akhalkalaki."

"The obligation was not tied to any deadlines or other terms. The timeframe and the terms of the operation of the Russian military bases and facilities in Georgia must be approved at bilateral negotiations," the ministry said.

It stressed, "If the Georgian side had not insisted on unrealistic deadlines for the withdrawal of the Russian bases, the issue could have been solved in 2000, and the withdrawal of our bases would have been a reality now."

The ministry also said that Russia "has fulfilled all of its obligations under the Istanbul agreement: weapons and hardware covered by the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty were reduced and withdrawn from Georgia in the agreed-upon period of time. Russia has also fulfilled its obligation to liquidate the military bases in Vaziani and Gudauta".

Meanwhile, Georgia has threatened to outlaw the Russian military bases if Tbilisi and Moscow fail to reach an agreement on the schedule of their withdrawal, Deputy Foreign Minister Merab Antadze said earlier.

"If Tbilisi and Moscow fail to reach a civilized agreement on the schedule of the withdrawal of two Russian bases from Georgia (in Batumi and Akhalkalaki), the Georgian side may outlaw these bases as one of the measures. But I will not speak ahead of time about how it can be done," he said.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

Antadze said that Georgia had proposed a clear-cut plan of the withdrawal of the Russian military bases.

"The Georgian side established the order in which the Russian bases should be withdrawn from Georgia," he said.

"We clearly determined the deadlines for preparing agreements on the withdrawal of the Russian military bases and their final closure, the deadlines for the enactment and implementation of these agreements," he said.

The plan also called for setting up bilateral expert groups to prepare a mechanism for creating an antiterrorist centre in Georgia.

Antadze said the Russian delegation "stated its readiness to implement this plan that was worked out by the Georgian side on the basis of the agreements reached earlier by the Security Council secretaries of Georgia and Russia."

However the Russian delegation "was not ready to conclude real agreements".

Antadze said Russia's proposals to tie up the creation of an antiterrorist centre to the terms and deadlines for the withdrawal of the Russian military bases from Georgia are unacceptable.

"The proposal to set up a Georgian-Russian antiterrorist centre in this country was an act of good will from the Georgian side, and its goal was to make the process of Russian troop pullout from the bases in Batumi and Akhalkalaki easier," Antadze said.

"The task of that centre would be to prevent terrorist acts on the territories of both Georgia and Russia," he added.

"But the talks on Friday showed that the Russian side ties up the creation of the centre to the terms and deadlines for the withdrawal of its military bases, which is totally unacceptable to Tbilisi," Antadze said.

"It looks like Moscow is trying to reorganise the structure and equipment tables of the bases into that this centre, but we don't agree to turning the bases into an antiterrorist facility," he said.

Igor Savolsky, the head of the Russian State Commission for Defense Talks with Georgia, said Friday: "Unfortunately, the talks were fruitless and they must be continued".

"There's a stumbling block, namely, how to interpret and fulfill the previous political agreements on the setting up of antiterrorist centres," he said.

"We believe Georgia has diverted from those agreements," Savolsky said.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

Antadze accused Russia of not having been ready to make decisions. "Over the last few days Tbilisi and Moscow conducted rather intensive negotiations in different formats on visa issues, on the delimitation of the state borders of the two countries, on the preparation of a framework treaty, and on military issues," he said.

However the Russian delegation "had no mandate and was not prepared for real results at the Georgian-Russian negotiations", Antadze said.

In his words, the Russian delegation "was not ready to make decisions" while "the Georgian side had very specific proposals and was ready to make compromises on certain issues".

The diplomat attributed the Russian delegation's reluctance to work towards "real results" at the negotiations to the upcoming visit to Tbilisi by Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov.

"Unfortunately, these Georgian-Russian meetings did not implement the agreements that were reached during a series of negotiations with the participation of the Security Council secretaries of the two countries," Antadze said.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Missile Defense System Talks Ongoing, Graham Says

*The Record, 11 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis*

Canadian participation in the U.S. missile defense program is still a live issue, despite opposition within the Liberal caucus and among rank-and-file in the party, Defense Minister Bill Graham said yesterday.

"The decision hasn't been taken, yet," he said.

Although some have suggested that Canadian participation -- which seemed highly likely as recently as last fall -- is now a dead duck, Graham cautioned against speculation.

Speaking in a telephone news conference from Nice, France, where he was taking part in meetings of NATO defense ministers, Graham said Ottawa is still discussing the issue with Washington.

"We're considering exactly what is the appropriate answer to give on ballistic missile defense," he said.

The Americans have asked Canada to join the missile program, although they say they want no territory or money. The two countries have already modified their Norad agreement to allow that organization to share information with the missile defense command.

Missile defense, already strongly opposed by the Bloc Quebecois and the NDP, has also run into flak from within Graham's own party.

A number of Liberal MPs oppose Canadian participation, as do many rank-and-file party members.

That opposition will crystallize at the party's Ottawa convention March 3-5, which is expected to deal with several policy resolutions on the issue.

"I know there's a resolution passed, I believe by the young Liberals, there's a resolution from the Quebec caucus, indicating they would prefer no participation in BMD," Graham said.

"I know there's also some resolutions from Ontario and other places saying, 'Look we have to discuss this with our American colleagues.' It's always been my position that what we have to do is discuss it."

The policy resolutions will play a role in the eventual decision, he said.

"Clearly, the Liberal party are making their point. We'll have those discussions at the Liberal party and caucus is making its point, so we'll deal with this in the course of our discussions with the Americans in making up our mind what to do."

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

The United States is in the process of deploying a handful of interceptor missiles which, along with high-powered radars and computer systems, make up the missile shield.

It's a limited system designed to knock down one or two missiles fired by accident or by some rogue state. It would be helpless in the face of a full-scale missile attack.

Opponents of the program claim it is just a stepping stone to the weaponization of space.

Graham said Canada will have no part of such a plan.



*Back  
to Top*

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## U.S. Interceptor Missile Fails to Launch in Test

Reuters, 15 February 2005, [www.reuters.com](http://www.reuters.com)

President Bush's planned ballistic missile shield suffered another setback on Monday when an interceptor missile again failed to launch during a test of the U.S. missile defense system.

The Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency said it could not complete the planned \$85 million repeat of a failed December test after the interceptor missile failed to launch from its base in the Pacific Ocean.

The interceptor missile, built by Orbital Sciences Corp., had also failed to launch during a Dec. 15 test, which officials later blamed on a "very minor software glitch."

Officials were working "feverishly" to determine the cause of the failed launch, said Chris Taylor, agency spokesman.

Preliminary indications pointed to a problem with the missile's ground support equipment, rather than the missile itself, which was good news for the program, said Rick Lehner, another spokesman for the agency.

"There is no indication that there is anything wrong with the actual interceptor," said Lehner.

But the failure to launch clearly spelled more bad news for a program that failed to meet the Bush administration's goal of declaring the system operational by the end of 2004.

Missile Defense Agency Director Lt. Gen. Henry Obering last month said the system could offer some limited capability to protect against a ballistic missile attack, despite failures in four of its nine major tests.

But John Isaacs, president of the Council for a Livable World, said the latest test failure proved the missile defense program was "not ready for prime time."

David Wright at the Union of Concerned Scientists agreed, saying, "This interceptor has never been tested in an intercept test. It's as if Henry Ford started up his automobile production line and began selling cars without ever taking one for a test drive."

Lehner said the investigation would take several weeks to complete, but officials would decide within a week whether to reschedule the test, or proceed with a test planned in April. He said it would take 60 days to ready another target missile.

A target missile carrying a mock warhead was successfully launched from Kodiak, Alaska at 9:22 p.m. local time on Sunday (1:22 a.m. EST), the agency said. The test was intended to see if the interceptor missile could shoot down the target.

A previous test two years earlier also failed.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

The Pentagon had planned to spend more than \$50 billion over the next five years on missile defense, but now it plans to cut spending on the system by \$5 billion over six years.

Bush's 2006 budget proposal would slash spending on ballistic missile defense, the single largest U.S. research and development project, by \$1 billion to about \$8.8 billion.

Boeing Co is prime contractor for the ground-based missile defense program. Raytheon Co. builds the kill vehicle for the interceptor missile. Northrop Grumman Corp makes the system's command and control system.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Japan's Cabinet OKs Missile Defense Bill

*The Associated Press, 15 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Japan's defense chief could order the military to shoot down incoming missiles under legislation endorsed by the Cabinet on Tuesday, less than a week after North Korea claimed that it has built nuclear weapons.

The bill is part of sweeping changes to Japan's defense policy launched by Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi long before the North Korean announcement. Critics say the reforms are dismantling the country's post-World War II policy of pacifism.

Chief Cabinet Secretary Hiroyuki Hosoda stressed that the Defense Agency head could only give the order to launch missiles if the nation were under attack. That authority normally rests with Parliament.

"Lately, there are more countries equipped with missiles. We need to deal with the situation immediately if a missile were to be launched at Japan," Hosoda said at a news conference.

Hosoda said Japan probably won't have a fully functioning missile-defense system, which is being jointly developed with the United States, for another few years. He said the failure of a U.S. missile defense test at an island base in the Pacific Ocean on Monday wouldn't affect Tokyo's plans because the U.S.-Japan missile shield works on different technology.

Japan is in the midst of a major defense review prompted by concerns about possible terrorist attacks and hostilities with neighboring North Korea.

In December, Japan adopted new defense guidelines that ease its nearly three-decades-old ban on arms exports to allow it to develop a missile defense program with its closest ally, the United States.

North Korea became one of Tokyo's biggest security worries after it test-fired a long-range ballistic missile over Japan in 1998, prompting Tokyo to begin researching missile defense.

On Thursday, the secretive communist nation announced that it has built nuclear weapons and was staying away from international disarmament talks -- raising the stakes of a two-year-old international standoff over the North's nuclear ambitions.

Following Tuesday's Cabinet approval, the bill is expected to go to Parliament later this week, Koizumi spokesman Yu Kameoka said.

Under the legislation, the Defense Agency, Cabinet and top security officials would compile a plan of action to protect the nation from a missile attack. The prime minister would be required to notify Parliament that Japan's military had been ordered to defend against incoming missiles.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

Currently, the prime minister must get permission from the Cabinet before activating the military, even in emergencies. Parliament then must give its approval for the mobilization after the fact.

Japan's postwar pacifist constitution renounces war and the use of military force in settling international disputes.

The country's military possesses short-range missiles under a defensive policy that falls within government interpretations of the constitution. But Japan is also reportedly studying long-range surface-to-surface missiles, giving it the ability to make a pre-emptive strike in foreign territory.



*Back  
to Top*

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

## Iran-EU Nuclear Negotiations Begin

*Arms Control Association, January/February 2005, [www.armscontrol.org](http://www.armscontrol.org)*

Foreign ministers from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom met Dec.13 with Hassan Rowhani, secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, to open negotiations toward a long-term resolution of concerns surrounding Tehran's nuclear programs. The United States offered cautious public support for the talks.

In a Dec. 16 interview, a European diplomat described the initial high-level discussions, which also included Javier Solana, the European Union's high representative on foreign policy and security issues, as "more symbolic than substantive," adding that no negotiations took place. The ministers left substantive issues to be hashed out by three working groups.

The working groups are tasked with developing proposals for cooperation on nuclear and non-nuclear technical projects as well as political and security issues. The groups will report to a steering committee, which will review the groups' progress after three months. (See ACT, December 2004.) The groups have devised a rough schedule for monthly meetings, according to U.S. and European officials. Two working group meetings already took place in December.

The meeting was the result of a negotiating framework agreed to by Iran and the three European Union countries in November. At that time, Iran also agreed to suspend work on its uranium-enrichment program for the duration of the talks and to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) monitoring of this suspension.

In the long-term negotiations, the European governments are seeking a permanent end to Tehran's nuclear fuel efforts, particularly its gas centrifuge-based uranium-enrichment program. Iran originally agreed to suspend its enrichment activities in October 2003 but continued work on some elements of its centrifuge program.

European governments, as well as the United States, are concerned that Iran intends to produce its own nuclear materials not for peaceful purposes but to build nuclear weapons. While nuclear power plants usually employ low-enriched uranium, highly enriched uranium can provide the fuel for nuclear weapons, as can plutonium separated from irradiated nuclear fuel.

Iran also has begun construction of a heavy water research reactor, which could provide a source of weapons-grade plutonium. Western concerns have been heightened by a more than two-year old IAEA investigation which revealed that Iran conducted a variety of covert nuclear activities. (See ACT, December 2004.)

Persuading Iran to renounce permanently its ambitions to develop an independent nuclear fuel cycle will almost certainly be difficult. The November agreement states only that the final agreement will include "objective guarantees that Iran's nuclear program is exclusively for peaceful purposes." Tehran, however, has not articulated its version of objective guarantees and has repeatedly said the suspension must be temporary, although some Iranian officials have hinted at the possibility of compromise. (See ACT, November 2004.)

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



Back  
to Top



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

Rowhani stated Dec.12 that Tehran “will continue the talks if we feel that they are progressing,” the official Islamic Republic News Agency reported, but Iranian officials have indicated that they want the talks to be concluded quickly. Official statements concerning an exact timeline have been ambiguous but indicate that Iran will give the talks at least several months.

## *Future Diplomacy*

Although several U.S. officials have expressed skepticism that Iran will adhere to its suspension agreement, Washington is publicly supporting the negotiating process. Apparently countering speculation that Washington will take a harder line on Tehran, Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage said Dec.1 that talk of military strikes on Iranian nuclear facilities is “irresponsible.” Armitage later downplayed the prospects for a successful regime change strategy, saying Dec. 20 that the Iranian opposition would not necessarily “eschew nuclear weapons.” Secretary of State Colin Powell was more direct in a Dec.10 speech in the Netherlands, reiterating that “U.S. policy is not to advocate regime change in Iran.”

However, tensions between the United States and the Europeans could increase as a February IAEA Board of Governors meeting approaches. The board adopted a resolution in late November that emphasizes the suspension’s importance but does not specify any consequences if Iran violates the agreement. The resolution, however, does request IAEA Director-General Mohamed ElBaradei to notify board members if Tehran either fails to implement the suspension or impedes IAEA monitoring.

A State Department official told Arms Control Today that the timing of the next Euro-Iran steering committee meeting, which will probably occur in March, could complicate any U.S. proposals for the IAEA to take action if Iran violates the suspension. The Europeans might argue that such efforts will undercut ongoing diplomacy, the official said.

Washington has repeatedly pushed for resolutions that take a harder line on Iran at past board meetings but has failed to persuade the other board members to agree.

The United States also continues to express concern that Iran is pursuing covert nuclear activities. U.S. Ambassador Jackie Sanders told the IAEA board Nov. 29 that Washington wants Iran “immediately” to provide access to Iran’s Parchin military complex, which U.S. officials believe might have facilities that could be used to test conventional high explosives for use in an implosion-type nuclear weapon. The IAEA has not yet received permission to visit, the State Department official said Dec. 16. (See ACT, October 2004.)

Washington failed to persuade the board to adopt language giving the IAEA expanded authority to inspect Iranian facilities. Instead, the November resolution requests that Iran “provide any access deemed necessary by the Agency” in accordance with Iran’s additional protocol to its IAEA safeguards agreement.

Safeguards agreements require states-parties to the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to allow the IAEA to monitor their declared civilian nuclear activities to ensure that they are not diverted to

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

military use. Additional protocols augment the agency's authority to detect clandestine nuclear activities, but there are limits to the agency's ability to inspect military facilities. Tehran has signed an additional protocol and has agreed to abide by its provisions until Iran's parliament ratifies the agreement.

On the trade front, Washington's lack of enthusiasm for engagement with Iran could also complicate the negotiations. The suspension agreement states that the Europeans "will actively support the opening of Iranian accession negotiations" at the World Trade Organization (WTO). A State Department official told Arms Control Today Dec. 20 that the Europeans wanted a WTO General Council meeting earlier in the month to call for negotiations to begin, but the U.S. delegation said that Washington is not ready to move forward on the matter. U.S. support is necessary because the WTO makes decisions by consensus.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Report: N. Korea Demands Talks With U.S.

*The Associated Press, 11 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

North Korea has demanded bilateral talks with the United States to defuse the tension created by its announcement that it is a nuclear power, the communist state's U.N. envoy said in a South Korean newspaper Friday.

Han Sung Ryol, a senior diplomat from the U.N. delegation in New York, was the first North Korean official to speak to outside news media since Pyongyang's Foreign Ministry defied the United States and its allies by declaring Thursday it has nuclear weapons.

In the announcement - its first public disclosure that it has the weapons - North Korea said its arsenal is a deterrent against a U.S. invasion, and it does not intend to join six-nation disarmament talks anytime soon. The weapons claim could not be independently verified.

"We will return to the six-nation talks when we see a reason to do so and the conditions are ripe," Han told Seoul's Hankyoreh newspaper in an interview published Friday. "If the United States moves to have direct dialogue with us, we can take that as a signal that the United States is changing its hostile policy toward us."

Han's suggestion came as the 2-year-old standoff over North Korea's nuclear weapons programs plummeted to a new low.

North Korea sees its nuclear programs as a way of ensuring the survival of leader Kim Jong Il's regime. In return for giving up its nuclear ambitions, it seeks massive aid, diplomatic recognition, an end to economic sanctions, and a nonaggression treaty with the United States.

North Korea's long-running strategy has been to try to engage the United States in bilateral talks, believing such meetings would boost the isolated country's international status and help it win bigger concessions.

In the current six-nation talks, North Korea has increasingly found itself surrounded by countries, including allies China and Russia, who are critical of its nuclear ambitions. Since 2003, the United States, the two Koreas, China, Japan and Russia have held three rounds of talks in Beijing, but no significant progress has been made.

The United States has refused to engage in bilateral talks.

Former President Clinton forged a bilateral deal in 1994 obligating North Korea to freeze its nuclear activities in return for oil and other aid. But Bush administration officials say the old deal was a failure that should not be repeated because North Korea flouted it by running a secret uranium-enrichment program.

They champion a new six-nation multilateral deal that could bind the North with commitments to China and Russia. China's aid and trade keep North Korea's economy from collapsing.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

When asked whether the North's announcement would cause friction with Beijing, Han said his country has "always made our decisions independently based on our own judgment and on our own national interest."

"We are not affected by outside countries' pressure, mediation and persuasion. In fact, we believe that China will help persuade the United States to abandon its hostile policy toward us," he said in the interview.

Governments around the world have expressed concern over North Korea's nuclear statement and urged it to return to talks. But North Korea says it will not do so as long as Washington maintains its "hostile" policy toward the North.

"The key is a change in the hostile U.S. policy toward the North," Han was quoted as saying. "We have no other option but to regard the United States' refusal to have direct dialogue with us as an intention not to recognize us and to eliminate our system."

Hopes for the resumption of talks rose after President Bush began his second term without using harsh words against the Stalinist regime. But Pyongyang said Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice's labeling of it last month as one of the "outposts of tyranny" was insult enough to scuttle the diplomatic process.

North Korea believed Bush's recent emphasis on spreading freedom and ending tyranny around the world "effectively targeted" the isolated state, Han said.

"Although Bush didn't mention our country by name, the context makes it clear that there is a strong connection with" the comments by Rice, he said.

South Korea urged the United States and its allies to be calm following North Korea's sudden declaration, reminding them that blustering and brinksmanship are nothing new in Pyongyang's toolbox of diplomatic tactics.

It is important to remember that "North Korea has shown similar attitudes in times of crucial negotiations" in the past, South Korea's Yonhap news agency quoted South Korean Foreign Minister Ban Ki-moon as saying.

But South Korean officials also cautioned that North Korea could take further steps to raise tensions - such as shipping weapons materials to other countries with nuclear ambitions or even testing a bomb.

The North's announcement and decision to pull out of the talks was "a matter of grave concern," Ban told reporters in Washington, where he arrived on a previously scheduled trip to meet Rice.

In Seoul, Vice Foreign Minister Lee Tae-shik told members of the ruling Uri party that "the North's move appears to be aimed at improving its negotiating power."

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

But he warned "the problem could get very serious if North Korea takes additional actions," Uri Party spokesman Lim Jong-suk said.

South Korea's take on North Korea's announcement reflects its decades-long experience in dealing with North Korean officials, who pepper their negotiating rhetoric with shouts, threats and dire warnings of imminent clashes.

Since the nuclear crisis erupted in late 2002, North Korea has steadily increased the stakes. It first removed U.N. seals on its mothballed nuclear facilities, expelled the last U.N. nuclear monitors and quit the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. It later said it completed reprocessing 8,000 spent fuel rods to extract weapons-grade plutonium.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.

---

## US Rejects Bilateral Talks with North Korea on Nuclear Issue

*The Press Trust of India, 12 February 2005, accessed via lexis-nexis*

The United States has rejected the possibility of bilateral talks with North Korea on the nuclear issue and asserted that the six-party parleys hosted by China were the way to resolve the matter.

"All parties in the region recognize that they have a stake in North Korea ending its nuclear weapon program. This is a regional matter that affects the countries in the region, and the US has made very clear its view. It is a view shared by the other parties in the talks", White House Press Secretary Scott McLellan told reporters Friday.

"The six-party talks (US, the two Koreas, China, Japan and Russia) are the way to resolve this matter in a peaceful and diplomatic way", he added.

Asked whether under no circumstances would the US agree to bilateral talks with North Korea, McClellan said "the problem is we have been down that road before. The 1994 Agreed Framework was the road that we went down before. It was a bilateral approach between the United States and North Korea".

"North Korea violated that agreement and continued to pursue nuclear weapons. All parties in the region believe they have a stake in making sure that there is a de-nuclearized Korean Peninsula", he said.

McLellan said the North Koreans "tend to say things from time to time and ramp up the rhetoric from time to time".

"We have also probably seen some mixed signals coming from them over the last couple of days with some saying that their intention is to come back to the talks and others talking about that they have simply suspended the talks", he said.

"I think all parties in the region are making it clear to North Korea that it needs to end its nuclear weapons program, that it needs to permanently dismantle that program and eliminate it for good", Mc Lellan said

"We have made it very clear that no one has an interest in attacking North Korea. That's very clear to North Korea. Our interest is in moving forward on the proposal that we outlined in the last round of talks", he said.

Asked whether the US would physically prevent any attempt by North Korea to export nuclear weapons, McClellan said proliferation was a top priority for the Administration.

"The President led the effort to establish the Proliferation Security Initiative to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and long range missiles and things of that nature. There are some 60 nations that are working on that effort".

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

"We achieved a great success when Libya agreed to dismantle its WMDs. And we have achieved an important success when it came to dismantling the A Q Khan network. And we continue to learn more and more about that. But proliferation will remain a top priority for this Administration. I previously expressed that is one of the concerns we have with regard to North Korea", he said.

  
[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Iran Shuns Demand to Abandon Nuke Reactor

*The Associated Press, 13 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Iran rejected a European demand to stop building a heavy-water nuclear reactor that provides a simpler way of extracting weapons-grade fuel, and it warned the United States on Sunday "not to play with fire" by repeatedly threatening Tehran.

Iran has indicated previously it will keep its heavy-water reactor, but Sunday's announcement that it will not replace it with a light-water reactor was the clearest statement yet of its nuclear plans and represented a hardening of its position.

Both plants in question can be used to enrich uranium, a critical part in nuclear programs, but the extraction of weapons-grade material from a light-water reactor is more difficult. Uranium enriched to low grades is used for fuel in nuclear reactors, but further enrichment makes it suitable for atomic bombs.

The statement underscored the unresolved differences between Iranian and European negotiators, who are continuing their talks over Iran's nuclear program even as the United States escalates its criticism of Iran.

Earlier this month, President Bush accused Iran in his State of the Union speech of being "the world's primary state sponsor of terror" and pursuing nuclear weapons. Although Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has said a military strike against Iran was "simply not on the agenda at this point," Bush has said his administration would not rule out any option.

On Sunday, Foreign Ministry spokesman Hamid Reza Asefi reiterated previous statements by top officials that Iran would not tolerate any acts of aggression, particularly from the United States.

"Rice and other U.S. officials are aware of Iran's capabilities." Asefi told reporters at a news briefing. "During the talks with the Europeans, we told them in clear terms to tell their American allies not to play with fire, and the Europeans clearly got our message."

Iranian President Mohammad Khatami last week warned that Iran would turn into a "scorching hell" for any possible attackers.

Iran, according to experts, is believed to be at least four years away from finishing construction of the heavy-water reactor near Arak, in central Iran. Those reactors use natural uranium rather than the enriched form, which is costlier and more complicated to produce.

Asefi rejected a proposal by European negotiators to stop building the 40-megawatt Arak reactor in return for a light-water reactor - from which the extraction of weapons-grade material is difficult.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

"We welcome the European offer ... but this won't replace the heavy-water research reactor at all. That will continue. We will pursue that," he said.

Iran's top leaders have been adamant in recent days that Iran will not scrap its nuclear program, suspected by Washington as a program to produce a nuclear bomb.

Asefi said Iran had long and intensive talks - "early steps forward" - with Europeans this week. He said Europe should step up its efforts to justify continuing the negotiations.

"During the talks, we tried to make it open that the nuclear fuel cycle has economic justification and that we will continue our activities in this field," Asefi said.

Asefi also said Iran plans to become a major nuclear fuel supplier, part of a program that Iran says is for peaceful domestic energy purposes but Washington says is aimed at producing an atomic bomb.

"We intend to turn into an important and a major player in the nuclear fuel supply market in the next 15 years because there will be (an) energy shortage in the future," Asefi said.

Separately, The Washington Post reported Sunday that the United States has been flying unmanned surveillance drones over Iran since last year to look for evidence of nuclear weapons programs and to probe the country's air defenses.

Asefi did not comment on the report, saying, "It's the job of the intelligence and security services to comment on this."

Iran suspended uranium enrichment and all related activities in November, hoping to build trust and avoid U.N. Security Council sanctions. The International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, is monitoring the suspension.



---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.





# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## **Bush: Nuclear Weapon Can Cause Iran-s Destabilizing**

*News From Russia, 14 February 2005, [www.newsfromrussia.com](http://www.newsfromrussia.com)*

U.S. sources have given conflicting signals about the veracity of a Washington Post report that said America has been using unmanned flights for the past year to gather intelligence on Iran's nuclear capability.

Three senior U.S. military officials disputed the article Sunday, but two well-placed U.S. government sources confirmed it, saying that the overflights have indeed been taking place.

The newspaper -- citing three U.S. officials -- reported that Washington has been using drones to look for evidence of nuclear weapons programs and to "detect weaknesses in air defenses."

Neither the CIA nor the Pentagon would comment Sunday on the apparent discrepancy, tells CNN News.

According to Reuters, the U.S. intelligence community, responding to Bush administration concerns about a nuclear-armed Iran, has begun reviewing its assessments of the Islamic Republic, from weapons capabilities to the stability of Tehran's government, U.S. officials said on Saturday.

The broad review includes a new National Intelligence Estimate, or NIE, intended to provide U.S. policy-makers with a comprehensive profile of Iran's economic, political and military strengths, officials said.

A second report, called a "memo to holders," is aimed at updating information on Iran's weapons of mass destruction, or WMD, including nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. The memo, whose focus is subject to change, would amend a 2001 NIE on Iran.

The reviews come as the U.S. intelligence community faces huge credibility problems after reporting that pre-war Iraq had stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons and was pursuing nuclear arms. The assertions were a main justification for the 2003 U.S. invasion but no such weapons have been found.

The reports are being produced by separate authors without input from Bush administration policy-makers, an official said.

The review was ordered by the CIA's National Intelligence Council, which focuses on longer-term intelligence issues, at a time when the Bush administration has hardened its rhetoric over Iran.

U.S. officials say that Iran is pursuing nuclear weapons under the guise of a civilian energy program, a charge that Tehran denies.

President Bush warned this week that a nuclear-armed Iran would be "very destabilizing."

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## IAEA: Egypt Up Front About Atomic Arms

*The Associated Press, 14 February 2005, [www.ap.org](http://www.ap.org)*

Egypt's nuclear experiments were small, basic and do not appear part of an attempt to make weapons, the U.N. atomic monitoring agency said Monday, praising Cairo's cooperation with an investigation of the country's now mothballed clandestine activities.

The report, compiled by the International Atomic Energy Agency, made clear that investigations will continue into the atomic research that stretched back four decades and ended as recently as five years ago.

Still, the summary, released to diplomats accredited to the agency and leaked to The Associated Press, went some way in dispelling concerns that, faced with potential threats from Israel and Iran, Egypt had explored developing nuclear arms.

The Vienna-based agency suggested that it has not found anything so far to challenge Cairo's assertions that its activities did not go beyond the laboratory and did not include enriching uranium or separating plutonium - two processes used to make the fissile core of nuclear arms,

And the agency said Egypt appeared to be telling the truth when it said that the activities were not divulged to the agency because the country assumed it did not have an obligation to do so.

The report said investigations since September have not come up with a smoking gun. "The nuclear material and facilities seen by the agency to date are consistent with the activities described by Egypt," it said. It also welcomed Cairo's cooperation with the agency inquiry.

Still, "irrespective of the ... small amounts of nuclear material involved, the repeated failures by Egypt to report nuclear material and facilities to the agency in a timely manner are a matter of concern," said the report.

A senior diplomat close to the IAEA suggested that agency officials were not expecting further investigations to raise concerns that Egypt - which has expressed concern both about a nuclear-armed Israel and Iran's potential to develop such arms - was actively working to create a weapons program.

Asked about minute traces of plutonium found by agency inspectors, he said there appeared to be no reason to question official explanations that they were instances of contamination from fuel in one of the country's small research reactors.

The focus of the IAEA investigation were the country's two research reactors, along with a partially assembled laboratory meant to separate small quantities of plutonium, all located at the Inshas center, northeast of Cairo.

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

The diplomat, who demanded anonymity, suggested the Egyptian program was less a cause for concern than other secret activities recently investigated by the agency, including those of Iran and South Korea.

"The big difference is that there is no enrichment involved here," he said, alluding to South Korean uranium-enrichment experiments. He also suggested the Egyptians were more forthcoming with information than the South Koreans.

In the report, Egypt was faulted for failing to tell the agency about imports of small amounts of uranium compounds and other substances that can be used both for peaceful or weapons-related nuclear programs, and about testing of facilities that can be used as part of such programs.

It also should have reported about small-scale laboratory experiments linked to preliminary stages of enrichment and separation, and neglected to provide the agency with original or updated plans of facilities used in such research.

Most of the activities took place before 1982, when Egypt signed an agreement with the IAEA committing it to transparency about its nuclear activities. Still, under the agreement, the country had an obligation to retroactively report on pre-agreement activities as well, said the report.

Throughout the inquiry, Cairo has claimed that its scientists were involved in small-scale activities generated by interest in the nuclear fuel cycle for creating energy and characterized lack of reporting as sloppiness.

In extreme cases of concern and widespread suspicions of an attempt to make nuclear arms, the agency's 35-nation board can report countries that don't adhere to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to the U.N. Security Council.



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

## Iran Six Months from Having Knowledge to Build Nuclear Bomb: Israel

Agence France-Presse, 16 February 2005, accessed via [www.spacewar.com](http://www.spacewar.com)

Iran is only six months away from having the knowledge to build a nuclear bomb, Israeli Foreign Minister Silvan Shalom said Wednesday during a visit to London.

"They are trying very hard to develop this nuclear bomb," Shalom told reporters at a briefing in the British capital.

"It is very important, because the question is not if the Iranians develop a nuclear bomb in 2009, 2010 or 2011," he said.

"The main question is, are they going to develop the knowledge to do it? We believe that in six months from today they are going to end all the tests and experiments they are doing in order to have that knowledge."

Iran's nuclear program was a problem that must be tackled by the entire world, said Shalom, who arrived in London late Tuesday from Paris.

"Terrorism and Iran were Israel's problem for a very long time," he said.

"But I believe we realize now that it is not only our problem. Terrorism can hit everywhere and against everyone."

Shalom's remarks contradicted those made by Mohamed ElBaradei, the head of the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) examining Iran's nuclear program, which Tehran insists is purely for civilian energy purposes.

"On Iran, there really hasn't been much development, neither as a result of our inspections or as a result of intelligence," ElBaradei told Wednesday's edition of the Washington Post newspaper.

The European Union is engaged in talks with Iran over the issue, but these have been deadlocked by Tehran's refusal to permanently end uranium enrichment, which the United States claims Tehran wants to use to make atomic weapons.

In November, Iran suspended enrichment, but says it will resume this if talks with the EU negotiators Britain, France and Germany fail to progress.

Shalom said that Tehran should face the threat of United Nations sanctions if it did not fall into line.

"We know about the efforts of the EU, but still I believe that the Iranians should know that if they do not comply the Iranian file will be moved to the (UN) Security Council," he said.

"Otherwise they won't have any incentive to comply."

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.



# WEEKLY TREATY REVIEW

11 – 17 February 2005

**DTRA**

---

He added: "We believe that Iran will never abandon their dream. We know the real intentions of Iran."

Analysts were divided on Wednesday as to whether Shalom's six-month warning was realistic.

"The general consensus is that things are moving along on at quite a rapid scale, and they will certainly have the theoretical capability to create and perhaps even deliver a nuclear capability within the next year and a half," said Rory Miller of King's College, part of London University.

"When he (Shalom) says knowledge in six months, that must be something viable, something which is possible," he said.

However, Chris Rundle from Durham University's Institute for Middle Eastern and Islamic Studies said he was "a bit skeptical".

"In the 1990s, the Israelis were saying consistently Iran would have the bomb within three or five years," he said

"At the present stage, I don't see how they could suddenly leap to (the weapons stage)... weaponization takes some time and they haven't conducted any nuclear tests."



[Back  
to Top](#)

---

News articles and publications found on the DTIRP website are compilations of open source current news articles and commentary concerning significant arms control treaty and related national security issues. The publications aim to give a balanced representation of how the public, other government organizations, and the media may view these arms control and threat reduction programs and issues. They are intended to serve the informational needs of Department of Defense (DoD) officials in the continuing assessment of defense policies, programs and actions. Further reproduction or redistribution for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. The views and opinions expressed in these articles are not necessarily those supported by DoD, the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, or the DTIRP.